

Appl. No. 09/767,800
Amdt. dated 11/29/04
Reply to Office action of 5/27/04

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1 and 5-17 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

In the second item under Claim Rejections-35 USC § 102 on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 1 and 5-17 have been rejected as being anticipated by Knittel (U.S. 6,606,280) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. Support for the changes is found on page 11, lines 15-21 of the specification of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful. Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, a voice controller for a voice-controlled apparatus having a voice-controlled receiver, having:

a sound source with a transmitter for transmitting sound information being obtained from audio signals of the sound source being mixed together encoded and/or modulated and converted into the sound information;

a sound detector detecting a sound signal containing a voice command, the sound detector having a voice recognizer recognizing the voice command, and the sound detector converting the voice command into a corresponding control signal for the voice-controlled apparatus;

a sound signal processor coupled to the sound detector and the receiver, the sound signal processor correcting the sound signal by eliminating the sound information from the sound signal to produce a corrected sound signal, and supplying the corrected sound signal to the voice recognizer for evaluation;

the sound detector, the receiver, the sound signal processor, and the voice recognizer being disposed in a mobile part provided separately from the voice-controlled apparatus;

the mobile part having a transmitter transmitting the corresponding control signal to the voice-controller receiver;
and

the transmitter of the mobile part communicating with the voice-controller receiver by a wireless communication channel.
(emphasis added)

Knittel discloses a voice-controlled apparatus including a mobile part (remote unit 29) and a stationary part (base unit 31). The base unit is connected to the different devices to be controlled. The remote unit 29 of Knittel includes a microphone and an antenna 33. The antenna 33 serves for transmitting sound signals received by the microphone 45 to the base unit. The base unit includes a device for processing the sound signal received from the remote unit and the sound signals from the devices to be controlled. The base unit further includes speech recognition apparatus.

In contrast to voice-controlled apparatus according to the present claimed invention, Knittel does not disclose a sound source with a transmitter for generating the sound information (generated by the transmitter) from audio signals of the sound source. The audio signals of the system are mixed together, encoded and/or modulated and converted into analog or digital sound information which is transmitted by the transmitter.

Knittel does not show or suggest "a sound source with a transmitter for transmitting sound information being obtained from audio signals of the sound source being mixed together encoded and/or modulated and converted into the sound information" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Independent claim 11 contains a similar limitation.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1 or claim 11. Claims 1 and 11 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1 or 11.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 5-17 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

Appl. No. 09/767,800
Amdt. dated 11/29/04
Reply to Office action of 5/27/04

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$980.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner and Greenberg, P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



F. Donald Paris (24,054)

FDP/bb

November 29, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101